



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/838,428	04/19/2001	Janani Janakiraman	AUS920010015US1	3585

35525 7590 06/29/2005

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

RIES, LAURIE ANNE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/838,428

Applicant(s)

JANAKIRAMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Laurie Ries

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 15 April 2005, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

- (1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,
- (2) request reinstatement of the appeal.

If reinstatement of the appeal is requested, such request must be accompanied by a supplemental appeal brief, but no new amendments, affidavits (37 CFR 1.130, 1.131 or 1.132) or other evidence are permitted. See 37 CFR 1.193(b)(2).

The rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbon (U.S. Publication 2004/0078188 A1) in view of Cramer (U.S. Publication 2002/0104096 A1) has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment and newly found prior art.

Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, and 17-21 are pending. Claims 1, 8, and 15 are independent claims

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2176

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cruz ("A User-Centered Interface for Querying Distributed Multimedia Databases") in view of Bulterman ("Embedded Video in Hypermedia Documents: Supporting Integration and Adaptive Control").

As per claims 1, 8, and 15, Cruz discloses a method, system and computer program product for presenting text from multimedia data to a user including receiving multimedia data containing an associated number of sets of text data, where the number of sets of text data includes a first text data set associated with a first number of video frames of the multimedia data, and a second text data set associated with a second number of video frames of the multimedia data. Note that a "set" is defined as "a group of things that belong together and are so used" (See The American Heritage Dictionary, Fourth Edition, Page 1269, definition of "set"), which, when applied to a set of text data, would include a sentence. Cruz shows in Figure 3, Page 593, a number of sentences associated with a number of video frames. Cruz also discloses extracting the associated number of sets of text data from the multimedia data, as shown in Figure 3 on Page 593. Cruz also discloses that, responsive to determining that the text in the multimedia data has changed from a first text data set to a second text data set, outputting the second text data set and a video frame of the second number of video frames, as described by Cruz on Page 591, Section 2.3, "Virtual Document Display", in which Cruz describes the returned objects positioned side by side, for comparison purposes, as they are traversed. Cruz

also shows, on Page 593, Figure 3, that the user is given the option to advance the display to another page, as shown by the “Previous” and “Next” buttons surrounding the information as to the number of pages returned. Cruz does not disclose expressly outputting the first text data set with a one video frame of the first number of video frames. Bulterman discloses this interface option in Figure 6 on Page 452. Cruz and Bulterman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting multimedia data to a user. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the single image with related text of Bulterman with the interface of Cruz. The motivation for doing so would have been to show a content-based relationship between the video image and the text, and to display relevant information based on screen resources available (See Bulterman, Page 451, “Presentation Constraints”, lines 13-14, and Page 452, lines 1-3). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bulterman with Cruz for the benefit of showing a content-based relationship between the video image and the text, and displaying relevant information based on screen resources available to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1, 8, and 15.

As per claims 3, 10, and 17, Cruz and Bulterman disclose the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 as described above. Cruz also discloses that more than one of the number of sets of text data are presented to the user simultaneously, as shown in Figure 3, Page 593, which shows several sentences displayed simultaneously.

As per claims 4, 11, and 18, Cruz and Bulterman disclose the limitations of claims 3, 10, and 17 as described above. Bulterman also discloses that more than one of the number of sets of text data are presented in separate frames, as shown by Bulterman in Figure 7, on Page 453. Bulterman illustrates an interface with text presented in both “UK English” and “NL Dutch”.

Cruz and Bulterman are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of presenting multimedia data to a user. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to combine the multiple sets of text data of Bulterman with the interface of Cruz. The motivation for doing so would have been to present data that is available in more than one language (See Bulterman, Page 451, "Presentation Constraints", lines 5-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Bulterman with Cruz for the benefit of presenting data that is available in more than one language to obtain the invention as specified in claims 4, 11, and 18.

As per claims 5, 12, and 19, Cruz and Bulterman disclose the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 as described above. Cruz also discloses that the first text data set and the second text data set are presented to the user individually in a sequential order (See Cruz, Page 593, Figure 3).

As per claims 6, 13, and 20, Cruz and Bulterman disclose the limitations of claims 5, 12, and 19 as described above. Cruz also discloses that a next set of text data in the sequential order is presented in response to an indication by the user to display the next set of text data, as shown by the scroll bar included in the box containing text data in Figure 3, Page 593.

As per claims 7, 14, and 21, Cruz and Bulterman disclose the limitations of claims 1, 8, and 15 as described above. Cruz also discloses parsing the multimedia data to determine the first text data set and the one video frame of the number of video frames, as shown by the "Next" button provided in Figure 3, Page 593; and discarding any moving image data, which is accomplished by deselecting the "video" checkbox in Figure 2, Page 593.

Response to Arguments


Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-13, and 16-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LR


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100